Remarks

Amendments to the claims

Claims 20-29 and 36 have been cancelled as indicated above.

New claims 37-65 have been added as provided above. In particular, new claim 37 corresponds to claim 26 (now cancelled) rewritten in independent form and including all of the limitations of claim 20 (now cancelled) upon which claim 26 depends. Also, new claim 46 corresponds to claim 28 (now cancelled) rewritten in independent form and including all of the limitations of claim 20 (now cancelled) upon which claim 28 depends. New claims 38-45 depend upon new claim 37, while new claims 47-53 depend upon new claim 46. New claim 54 (and new claims 55-65 that depend thereon) recites limitations supported within the specification as originally filed.

Support for new claims 37-65 can be found at least in the specification at page 2, line 20 to page 29, line 18. No new matter has been introduced by way of new claims 37-65. The Applicants assert that new claims 37-65 are patentably distinct and are allowable.

Claim Objections

Claim 23 (now cancelled) stands objected to due to informalities. Specifically, claim 23 recites "the wall element..." wherein claim 21 from which claim 23 depends includes no such element or limitation. As claim 23 has been cancelled as indicated above, the Applicants believe that this objection is now moot.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 20, 22, 26, 27 and 36 (now cancelled, respectively) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ino et al. (JP-03013691-A). As claims 20, 22, 26, 27 and 36 have been cancelled as

S/N: 10/609,299 Case RU01-P11-2 Amendment "B" indicated above, the Applicants believe that the respective rejections of claims 20, 22, 26, 27 and 36 are now moot.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 21 and 23 (now cancelled, respectively) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ino et al. (JP-03013691-A), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,973,197 to Dallimer et al.

Claims 24 and 25 (now cancelled, respectively) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ino et al. (JP-03013691-A), in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,973,197 to Dallimer et al., in further view of Ino et al. (JP-03017311-A).

As claims 21 and 23-25 have been cancelled as indicated above, the Applicants believe that the respective rejections of claims 21 and 23-25 are now moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 28 and 29 (now respectively cancelled) are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (page 6 of Office Action).

New claim 46 corresponds to claim 28 (now cancelled) rewritten in independent form and includes all of the limitations of claim 20 (now cancelled) from which claim 28 depends. Furthermore, new claim 47 corresponds to claim 29 (now cancelled) rewritten to depend upon new claim 46. Thus, the Applicants assert that new claim 46, and new claims 47-53 that depend thereon, are allowable.

Initial Observations

In the interest of cooperation and expedient prosecution toward the allowance of new claims 37-53, the Applicants offer the following initial observations and assertions with respect to the Examiner-cited references of the pending Office Action:

Regarding new independent claim 37, Ino et al. (JP-03013691-A; hereinafter, Ino '691) fails to provide, teach or suggest <u>driving sheet piling</u> to define an inner <u>perimeter and an outer perimeter for the continuous concrete slab to thereby place</u> the first and second portions in general vertical alignment with one another, as recited in combination with the other features and limitations of new claim 37. In fact, Ino '691 fails to provide, teach or suggest the <u>driving of sheet pilings</u>, in any context.

Furthermore, Ino et al. (JP-03017311-A; hereinafter, Ino '311) fails to cure the deficiencies of Ino '691. In particular, Ino '311 fails to provide, teach or suggest driving sheet piling to define an inner perimeter and an outer perimeter for the continuous concrete slab to thereby place the first and second portions in general vertical alignment with one another, as recited in combination with the other features and limitations of new claim 37. Rather Ino '311 is directed to substantially the same subject matter as Ino '691 (i.e., the underground walls 10 and 20 of Ino '311 are substantially analogous to the underground walls 1 of Ino '691, etc.). In any case, Ino '311 fails to provide, teach or suggest the driving of sheet pilings, in any way or for any purpose.

Further still, U.S. Patent No. 4,973,197 to Dallimer et al. (hereinafter, Dallimer) fails to provide teach or suggest <u>driving sheet piling</u> to define an inner <u>perimeter and an outer perimeter for the continuous concrete slab to thereby place</u> the first and second portions in general vertical alignment with one another, as recited in combination with the other features and limitations of new claim 37.

Rather, Dallimer is directed to burying silos wherein each silo is equipped with a cutter 28 and a fluid-inflatable sleeve 214. In any case, Dallimer is completely devoid of sheet pilings in any context.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants assert that new independent claim 37 is allowable. As new claims 38-45 depend upon new claim 37, they too are allowable by virtue of their dependence upon an allowable base claim.

With respect to new independent claim 54, neither Ino '331 nor Ino '691 provides, teaches or suggests <u>fabricating a subterranean structure wherein no wall element of the subterranean structure is provided until after at least some of the concrete slab has been formed, as recited in combination with the other features and limitations of new claim 54. To the contrary, both Ino '331 and Ino '691 teach that underground wall elements (i.e., walls 10 and 20 of Ino '331; walls 1 of Ino '691) are formed or otherwise provided prior to formation of any other structural elements. This is not the same as method recited by new independent claim 54.</u>

Dallimer fails to cure the deficiencies of the Ino '331 and Ino '691 references. Specifically, Dallimer fails to provide, teach or suggest <u>fabricating a subterranean structure wherein no wall element of the subterranean structure is provided until after at least some of the concrete slab has been formed</u>, as recited in combination with the other features and limitations of new claim 54. In fact, Dallimer is completely devoid of a concrete slab, in any context. Thus, Dallimer does not teach or suggest waiting to <u>provide a wall element for a subterranean structure until after at least some of a concrete slab of that structure is formed</u>.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that new independent claim 54 is allowable. As new claims 55-65 depend upon new claim 54, it is axiomatic that they too are allowable.

1

2

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

Request for Extension of Time

The applicant hereby requests a two (2) month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) to respond to the current Office Action, to and through August 29, 2004. The fee for the two month extension is enclosed herewith.

Fees for Additional Claims

The fee for 9 additional dependent claims is enclosed herewith.

Summary

The Applicants believe that this response constitutes a full and complete response to the Office Action. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request examination on the merits of new claims 37-65 in favor of timely allowance thereof.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the below-signed representative if the Examiner believes this will facilitate prosecution toward allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew F. RUSSELL

Robert L. RUSSELL

Date: August 24, 2004

Scott K. Gallert Agent for Applicants

Reg. No. 51,715

Phone: (509) 468-3229

Miller